



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/598,892 | 09/14/2006 | Martin Riddiford | 167/US | 1778 |
| 95437 7590 08/03/2010 Harness, Dickey & Pierce P.L.C. P.O. Box 8910 Reston, VA 20195 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| MANCHO, RONNIE M | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 3664 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 08/03/2010 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/598,892

Applicant(s)

RIDDIFORD, MARTIN

Examiner

RONNIE MANCHO

Art Unit

3664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Independent claims 1, and 10 calls for “the portable GPS navigation device is perpendicular to the top surface of the platform”. Applicant's original specification does not inherently have support for the claimed limitation. Thus the new limitation is new matter since applicant's original disclosure does not have possession of the claimed subject matter.

The rest of the claims that depend on claims 1 and 10 are thus rejected for depending on a rejected base claim.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 18, last line, “the RF connector” lacks antecedent basis. That is line 5 of the claim already recites two different connectors. Thus the connector applicant is referring to is not distinctly claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1- 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollenberg (6091956) in view of Kallis et al (6966533)

Regarding claim 1, Hollenberg (abstract; figs. 7 and 8; col. 8, lines 63 to col. 9, lines 14; col. 19, lines 63 to col. 89, lines 50) discloses a GPS navigation system comprising a dock 40 in combination with a portable GPS navigation device 2d (figs. 7 and 8; col. 19, lines 63 to col. 20, lines 51), in which the device is programmable with map data and a navigation application that enables a route to be planned between two user-defined places (geographic location information, col. 8, lines 63 to col. 9, lines 14; also see map information in fig. 6), wherein the dock 40 comprises:

a platform (see surface of unit 40 in figs. 7&8);

an RF connector 42d (fig. 8) on a top surface of the platform 40 designed to directly interface with an RF connector 43d (figs. 8) in the portable GPS navigation device 2d such that the portable GPS navigation device 2D is at an angle to the top surface of the platform 40, the

RF connector being configured to feed RF signals from an external aerial 22r to the portable GPS navigation device 2d when the portable navigation device 2d is correctly mounted on the dock 40 (figs. 7 and 8; col. 19, lines 63 to col. 20, lines 51).

In Hollenberg the device 2d (figs. 7&8) is similar to device 2a (fig. 2), 2b (fig. 4), 2c (fig. 6). Thus it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Hollenberg is just showing different scenarios of using the same GPS device.

Hollenberg did not particularly mention that the GPS device must be perpendicular to the top surface of the platform 40. Hollenberg further did not teach away from a perpendicular mounting of the GPS device. However, as known in the art, GPS devices are mounted at various angles that are convenient to people in a vehicle. Thus it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to mount the Hollenberg GPS device at a convenient angle including 90 degrees.

Hollenberg did not particularly mention a suction mount for mounting and removing the dock from a portion of a vehicle. However, Kalis (figs. 1&9; col. 6, lines 59-67) teaches of a GPS navigation system comprising a removable dock (20, 122, 124; fig. 9, col. 6, line 36+), wherein a suction mount (126, 134, fig. 9) enables the removable dock (20, 122, 124; fig. 9, col. 6, line 36+) to be removably connected to a portion of a vehicle (car windscreen col. 6, lines 65-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the electronic unit mounting art at the time the invention was made to modify Hollenberg as taught by Kalis (col. 1, lines 57+) for the purpose of providing a navigation system that is compact, easily removable, mounted, and easily viewed.

Regarding claim 2, Hollenberg (abstract; figs. 7 and 8; col. 8, lines 63 to col. 9, lines 14; col. 19, lines 63 to col. 89, lines 50) discloses the GPS navigation system of Claim 1 wherein the RF signals are GPS signals.

Regarding claim 3, Hollenberg (abstract; figs. 7 and 8; col. 8, lines 63 to col. 9, lines 14; col. 19, lines 63 to col. 89, lines 50) discloses the GPS navigation system of Claim 1, wherein the platform 40 is rotatably mounted as shown at 41 b and 41c (fig. 7; col. 19, lines 63 to col. 20, lines 3), wherein the GPS navigation device 2d is removably attached to the platform 40. Hollenberg did not disclose that the platform is rotatably mounted on an arm. However, Kalis teaches of a dock (20, 122, 124) that comprises a platform that is rotatably mounted on an arm (*the arm is the section joining 126 to 124 through pivot F in fig. 9; col. 6, lines 50-64*), and a GPS device 12 (fig. 1) that is removably attached to the docking platform (20, 122, 124).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the electronic unit mounting art at the time the invention was made to modify Hollenberg as taught by Kalis (col. 1, lines 57+) for the purpose of providing a navigation system is compact, easily mounted, and easily viewed.

Regarding claim 4, Spencer et al in view of Hollenberg disclose the GPS navigation system of Claim 3 in which the arm is pivotally mounted so that the platform (20, 122, 124; see Kalis fig. 9) can be moved vertically and horizontally (*the arm is the section joining 126 to 124 through pivot F in fig. 9; see Kalis col. 6, lines 50-64*).

Regarding claim 5, Hollenberg discloses the GPS navigation system of claim 1, but did not particularly mention a lip about which the GPS rotates and which is shaped to guide the GPS device in alignment with the dock. However, Kalis (figs. 1 and 9; col. 3, lines 35-39; col. 6,

lines 50-64) teaches of a navigation device comprising a lip 124 (fig. 9 of Kalis) about which a device 12 is designed to rotate when being mounted onto a dock (20, 122, 124, fig. 9), the lip 124 being shaped to guide the device 12 into correct alignment and engagement with the dock (20, 122, 124).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the electronic unit mounting art at the time the invention was made to modify Hollenberg as taught by Kalis (col. 1, lines 57+) for the purpose of providing a navigation system is compact, easily mounted and easily viewed.

Regarding claim 6, Hollenberg discloses the GPS navigation system of Claim 1, but did not disclose that it was mounted on a windshield. However, Kalis (col. 3, lines 23-35; col. 6, lines 65 and 66) teaches of a GPS device 12 mounted on a vehicle dashboard or windscreen.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the electronic unit mounting art at the time the invention was made to modify Hollenberg as taught by Kalis (col. 1, lines 57+) for the purpose of providing a navigation system is compact, easily mounted and easily viewed.

Regarding claim 7, Hollenberg discloses the GPS navigation system of claim 1, wherein the dock further comprises:

an internal antenna 42d (fig. 8), the internal antenna 42d being connected to the portable GPS navigation device 2d when the portable GPS navigation device 2d is correctly mounted on the dock.

Regarding claim 8, Hollenberg discloses the GPS navigation system of claim 1, wherein the portable GPS navigation device 2d is removably connectable to the dock 40 (figs. 7 and 8; col. 8, lines 63 to col. 9, lines 14; col. 19, lines 63 to col. 89, lines 50).

Regarding claim 9, Hollenberg discloses the GPS navigation system of claim 1, the GPS navigation system of Claim 1, wherein the dock includes an RF aerial connector 42d as the RF connector of the dock 40 (figs. 7 and 8; col. 8, lines 63 to col. 9, lines 14; col. 19, lines 63 to col. 89, lines 50).

Claims 10- 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollenberg (6091956) in view of Kalis et al (US 6966533) for having similar limitations as claims 1-9.

Regarding claim 18, Hollenberg (abstract; figs. 7 and 8; col. 8, lines 63 to col. 9, lines 14; col. 19, lines 63 to col. 89, lines 50) discloses a GPS navigation system comprising a dock 40 in combination with a portable GPS navigation device 2d (figs. 7 and 8; col. 19, lines 63 to col. 20, lines 51) that includes a display (see display in figs. 4&6), in which the device is programmable with map data and a navigation application that enables a route to be planned between two user-defined places (geographic location information, col. 8, lines 63 to col. 9, lines 14; also see map information in fig. 6), the dock 40 comprising:

an RF connector 42d (fig. 8) configured to directly couple with an RF connector 43d (figs. 8) in the portable GPS navigation device 2d in order to feed RF signals from an external aerial 22r to the portable GPS navigation device 2d when the portable navigation device 2d is correctly mounted on the dock 40 figs. 7 and 8; col. 19, lines 63 to col. 20, lines 51), wherein the portable GPS navigation device 2d is retained in an upright position when connected to the RF connector in the dock.

In Hollenberg the device 2d (figs. 7&8) is similar to device 2a (fig. 2), 2b (fig. 4), 2c (fig. 6). Thus it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Hollenburg is just showing different scenarios of using the same GPS device.

Hollenberg did not particularly mention a removable dock. However, Kalis (figs. 1&9; col. 6, lines 59-67) teaches of a GPS navigation system comprising a removable dock (20, 122, 124; fig. 9, col. 6, line 36+), wherein a suction mount (126, 134, fig. 9) enables the removable dock (20, 122, 124; fig. 9, col. 6, line 36+) to be removably connected to a portion of a vehicle (car windscreen col. 6, lines 65-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the electronic unit mounting art at the time the invention was made to modify Hollenberg as taught by Kalis (col. 1, lines 57+) for the purpose of providing a navigation system that is compact, easily removable, mounted, and easily viewed.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Communication

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RONNIE MANCHO whose telephone number is (571)272-6984. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs: 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tran Khoi can be reached on 571-272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ronnie Mancho/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3664

/Ronnie Mancho/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3664